

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments, which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

Applicant certifies that no new matter has been entered.

- 5        1.      Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the allowable subject matter of Claim 18. Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 31 have been amended to clarify the invention and to include the allowable limitations recited in Claim 18. Please cancel Claim 18 without prejudice.

**Claim rejections Under 35 USC 112**

- 10        2.      Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Examiner states that the phrase "initiating said first wireless signal, said indicator of said first device and said alarm of said second device activate to alert the user" is not disclosed by the specification. The original application discloses multiple devices configured per user, where each device may or may not be configured to alert the user to different messages. The Detailed Description section, page 10 lines 5-7 discloses that "multiple MWIDs may be associated with a single telephone number, in which case each may be configured differently or . . . identically." Further, page 10 lines 13-14 discloses that "each MWID may be registered and configured separately to alert a user to different communication statuses." Still further, Claim 10 of the application as originally filed teaches, "a method of registering a second message-indicating device for the user; and initiating said first signal to said second device when said first signal is initiated to said first device." The method of activation or deactivation of a single device does not
- 15
- 20
- 25

change the invention's teaching of multiple message-indicating devices per user. Claim 33 of the application as originally filed teaches a "system . . . comprising a second communication waiting indication device associated with the first user, said second device comprising an alarm; wherein said alarm of said second device is also activated in response to said first wireless signal." Thus, the specification did support that the same first signal is sent to the first device and also sent to the second device. In view of the disclosed specification, the description provided would have enabled one reasonably skilled in the art to which the invention pertains to make the invention.

10

**Claim rejections Under 35 USC 103**

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 12-15, 17, 19-21, 24, and 31 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin *et al.* (US6,630,883) (hereinafter "Amin"), and in view of Neustein (US6,418,305) (hereinafter "Neustein"), and further in view of Beyda *et al.* (US6,556,666) (hereinafter "Beyda"). Applicant respectfully submits that Amin, Neustein, and Beyda, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

Independent Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 31 have been amended to incorporate allowable limitations recited in allowable Claim 18 and, thus, are distinguishable over Amin, Neustein, and Beyda, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, and 24, dependent directly or indirectly from Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, and 20, respectively, are now limited by allowable Claim 18 and are therefore distinguishable over Amin, Neustein and Beyda taken alone or in combination, and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above regarding Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 31. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

4. Claims 4, 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin and Neustein and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,363,431 to Schull *et al.* (hereinafter "Schull"). Applicant respectfully submits that Amin, Neustein, and Schull, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

5  
Claims 4, 16 depend directly from allowable independent Claims 1 and 13 as amended, respectively, and Schull does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Amin and Neustein, taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 13, as amended, are distinguishable over Amin, Neustein, and Schull, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Claims 4, 16, dependent directly on Claims 1, and 13, respectively, are therefore distinguishable over Amin, Neustein, and Schull, taken alone or in combination, and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

10  
15  
5. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin and Neustein and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,838,226 to Houggy *et al.* (hereinafter "Hougg"). Applicant respectfully submits that Amin, Neustein, and Hougg, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

20  
25  
Claim 10 depends directly from allowable independent Claim 1 and Hougg does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Amin and Neustein, taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is distinguishable over Amin, Neustein, and Hougg, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Claim 10, dependent directly on Claim 1, is also distinguishable over Amin, Neustein, and Hougg, taken alone or in combination, and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

5

6. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin, Neustein and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,485 to Homan *et al.* (hereinafter "Homan"). Applicant respectfully submits that Amin, Neustein, and Homan, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

10

Claim 11 depends directly from allowable independent Claim 1 and Homan does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Amin and Neustein, taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is distinguishable over Amin, Neustein, and Homan, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Claim 11, dependent directly from Claim 1, is also distinguishable over Amin, Neustein, and Homan, taken alone or in combination, and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

15

7. Claims 22, 23 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin, in view of Neustein, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,588,038 to Snyder (hereinafter "Snyder"). Applicant respectfully submits that Amin, Neustein, and Snyder, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

20

Claims 22, 23 depend directly or indirectly on allowable independent Claim 20 as amended, and Snyder does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Amin and Neustein, taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 20, as amended, is distinguishable over Amin, Neustein, and Snyder, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Claims 22, 23, dependent from Claim 20 are also distinguishable over Amin, Neustein, and Snyder, taken alone or in combination, and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

25

8. Claim 25 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin, in view of Neustein, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,115 to Swistock (hereinafter "Swistock"). Applicant respectfully submits that Amin, Neustein, and Swistock, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

5  
10 Claim 25 depends directly on allowable independent Claim 20 as amended, and Swistock does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Amin and Neustein, taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 20, as amended, is distinguishable over Amin, Neustein, and Swistock, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Claim 25, dependent from Claim 20, is also distinguishable over Amin, Neustein, and Swistock, taken alone or in combination, and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

15 9. Claim 33 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,201,858 to Sundhar (hereinafter "Sundhar"). Applicant respectfully submits that Amin and Sundhar, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

20 25 Claim 33 depends directly on allowable independent Claim 31 and Sundhar does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Amin or the combination of Amin and Neustein. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 31, as amended, is distinguishable over Amin and Sundhar, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Claim 33, dependent directly from Claim 31, is also distinguishable over Amin and Sundhar, taken alone or in combination, and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

5

10. Claim 34 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,014,559 to Amin (hereinafter "Amin559"). Applicant respectfully submits that Amin and Amin559, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

10


Claim 34 depends directly on allowable independent Claim 31 and Amin559 does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Amin or the combination of Amin and Neustein. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 31, as amended, is distinguishable over Amin and Amin559, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Claim 34, dependent directly from Claim 31, is also distinguishable over Amin and Amin559, taken alone or in combination, and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are patentable and are now in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

5

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher Peil  
Reg. No. 45,005

10

Customer No. 22862